

United States Patent and Trademark Office

 ω

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/710,811	08/04/2004	David J. Lovell	00124-01075-US 4810		
23416 CONNOLLY F	7590 09/19/2007 BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, I	EXAMINER			
P O BOX 2207			COONEY, JOHN M		
WILMINGTO	N, DE 19899		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1711		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/19/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/710,811	LOVELL ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
John m. Cooney	1711	

John m. Code The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the code THE REPLY FILED 05 September 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICAT 1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same dath this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appear a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CF time periods:	ver sheet with the of ON IN CONDITION for as filing a Notice of as filing a Notice of an amendment, af (with appeal fee) in a 1.114. The reply motion. or (2) the date set forth ONTHS from the mailing CK BOX (b) WHEN TH	FOR ALLOWANCE. Appeal. To avoid abaution fidavit, or other evidence compliance with 37 Clust be filed within one in the final rejection, while date of the final rejection.	ndonment of ice, which FR 41.31; or (3) of the following
 THE REPLY FILED <u>05 September 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICAT 1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same dath this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appearance Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CF 	ON IN CONDITION of as filing a Notice of as filing a Notice of an amendment, af (with appeal fee) in a 1.114. The reply motion. Or (2) the date set forth ONTHS from the mailing CK BOX (b) WHEN TH	FOR ALLOWANCE. Appeal. To avoid abaution fidavit, or other evidence compliance with 37 Clust be filed within one in the final rejection, while date of the final rejection.	ndonment of ice, which FR 41.31; or (3) of the following
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same dath this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeara Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CF	as filing a Notice of an amendment, af (with appeal fee) in R 1.114. The reply motion. or (2) the date set forth DNTHS from the mailing CK BOX (b) WHEN TH	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl ust be filed within one in the final rejection, whi ig date of the final rejection	ice, which FR 41.31; or (3) of the following
this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeara Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CF) an amendment, af (with appeal fee) in R 1.114. The reply motion. or (2) the date set forth DNTHS from the mailing CK BOX (b) WHEN TH	fidavit, or other evident compliance with 37 Cl ust be filed within one in the final rejection, whi in date of the final rejection	ice, which FR 41.31; or (3) of the following
	or (2) the date set forth ONTHS from the mailin CK BOX (b) WHEN TH	g date of the final rejection	ichever is later. II
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejute b. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX No. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10	, ,	E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHE TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).			ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the p have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statuset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	corresponding amount ory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri ginally set in the final Office	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) a
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 3 filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time.	37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	is of the date of e appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the	date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered be	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration at	d/or search (see NC	TE below);	
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for a appeal; and/or 	peal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding	number of finally re	iected claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33	•	jected ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attac	,,	omnliant Amendment /	PTOL_324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	ica monoc or mon-oc		(* 10L-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if subnon-allowable claim(s).	mitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below of the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	entered, or b) ware appended.	ill be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9,14,20 and 21</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 10-13 and 15-19.			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or or because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient re was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	the date of filing a N sons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of A entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all r showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not	jections under appe	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status			•
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT page Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowar	ice because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)		
13. Other:		7	
		1PE	7 -
		John m Cooney Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1711	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants' proposed amendment sets forth combinations of limitations that have not been previously submitted for consideration and would require further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments pertaining to the rejection under 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph and the withdrawn claims are unpersuasive as they are directed towards amendments that have not been entered. Arguments pertaining to the rejections over prior art are unpersuasive as distinction is not made evident based on the disclosed barrier layers as claimed.